



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,679	03/12/2007	Dimitris Papadimitriou	P15013-US1	9389
27045	7590	02/16/2010	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			PITT, BRYAN W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/16/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/596,679	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PAPADIMITRIOU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Bryan Pitt	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-29,31-38 and 40-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-29,31-38 and 40-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment was received 19 November 2009 and has been entered. Claims 23, 30 and 39 were canceled. Claims 31 and 33 were amended. Claims 24-29, 31-38 and 40-44 are pending.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings were received on 19 November 2009. These drawings are acceptable.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 19 November 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that the cited reference Lahtinen (US 6,275,708) fails to teach the claim element (from original claim 30) "wherein the paging transactions are of at least one kind selected from the group consisting of Call Control transactions, Supplementary Services transactions, Short Message Service transactions and Location Services transactions". The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's assessment of the prior art and asserts that the above claim limitation is taught by Lahtinen for the following reasons:

4. Lahtinen teaches a method for limiting the paging load of a mobile communication system (see Lahtinen abstract). Lahtinen teaches that a mobile station is paged in the case of incoming calls or when the mobile station establishes a connection in order to make a call or to update its location (see Lahtinen Col. 1 line 52 to Col. 2 line 2) and that normal network operations can overload a conventional base

Art Unit: 2617

station subsystem with calls and location updates (see Lahtinen Col. 2 lines 5-9).

Lahtinen teaches that system overload can be prevented by counting new call initiation requests and limiting call initiation requests to a maximum allowed number of call initiation requests (see Lahtinen Col. 2 lines 33-44, Col. 4 lines 3-16). The Examiner further points out that in the previous rejection of the checking step of original claim 23, from which original claim 30 depended (see page 3 of the previous Office Action), the Examiner stated:

Regarding claim 23, Lahtinen teaches a method of controlling paging flow in a network for cellular communications, comprising the steps of

at a control node, receiving a request for paging a mobile station (i.e. Lahtinen teaches a mobile switching center (MSC, i.e. a control node) having to **send a call, therefore receiving a request for paging** a mobile station; Col. 4, lines 11-15);

determining a location area in which the paging shall be performed (i.e. the MSC limits the number of **calls to be initiated** for each location area, therefore determining a location area in which paging shall be performed; see Col. 5, lines 1-8, Col. 2, lines 33-44);

checking whether the number of paging transactions which are ongoing for the location area is lower than at least one maximum number of ongoing paging transactions allowed for the location area (i.e. the MSC checks the number of **calls to be initiated (paging transactions)** against a maximum value; Col. 2, lines 33-44, Col. 5, 1-8); and

after a determination that the number of ongoing paging transactions is lower than the maximum number, updating the number of ongoing paging transactions for the location area and processing the paging request (i.e. **new calls are initiated on request** until the number of counted calls is equivalent to a maximum allowed number of calls; Col. 2, lines 33-44. The MSC checks to see if the call counter has reached the threshold value and if not, allows the call and deducts from the value of the call counter (updates the number); Col. 4, lines 3-16). (emphasis added)

Requests to initiate a call are a type of Call Control transaction; therefore, the paging requests (i.e. transactions) taught by Lahtinen are Call Control transactions.

Art Unit: 2617

5. Accordingly the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the Examiner maintains the previous grounds of rejection. In an effort to improve the clarity of the previous grounds of rejections, the above additional citations from Lahtinen will be incorporated into the claim rejections of this Office Action. The Examiner respectfully submits that the grounds of rejection and the Examiner's interpretation of the prior art have not changed; therefore this Action is made FINAL.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6,275,708 to Lahtinen.

Regarding claim 29, Lahtinen teaches method according to claim 31, wherein the updating step further comprises the step of incrementing at least one counter indicative of the number of ongoing transactions which is comprised in the control node when a paging request is accepted for processing by the control node, and the step of decrementing the counter when a paging response has been returned by the mobile station (i.e. Lahtinen teaches increasing the call counter value in the MSC when a call is to be initiated (i.e. a paging request is accepted) and decreasing the call counter when a timer expires, indicating that the mobile station has released the resource; Col. 4, lines 47-59).

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding claim 31, Lahtinen teaches a method of controlling paging flow in a network for cellular communications, comprising the steps of

at a control node, receiving a request for paging a mobile station (i.e. Lahtinen teaches a mobile switching center (MSC, i.e. a control node) having to send a call, therefore receiving a request for paging a mobile station; Col. 4, lines 11-15);

determining a location area in which the paging shall be performed (i.e. the MSC limits the number of calls to be initiated for each location area, therefore determining a location area in which paging shall be performed; see Col. 5, lines 1-8, Col. 2, lines 33-44);

checking whether the number of paging transactions which are ongoing for the location area is lower than at least one maximum number of ongoing paging transactions allowed for the location area (i.e. the MSC checks the number of calls to be initiated (paging transactions) against a maximum value; Col. 2, lines 33-44, Col. 5, lines 1-8),

wherein the paging transactions are of at least one kind selected from the group consisting of Call Control transactions, Supplementary Services transactions, Short Message Service transactions and Location Services transactions (i.e. Lahtinen teaches that the calls to be initiated (paging requests) may be due to incoming voice calls (i.e. call control); Col. 2, lines 5-9. A mobile station is paged in the case of incoming calls or when the mobile station establishes a connection in order to make a call or to update its location (see Lahtinen Col. 1 line 52 to Col. 2 line 2) and system overload can be prevented by counting new call initiation requests and limiting call initiation requests to a

Art Unit: 2617

maximum allowed number of call initiation requests, therefore Call Control transactions;  
Col. 2 lines 33-44, Col. 4 lines 3-16);

after a determination that the number of ongoing paging transactions is lower than the maximum number, updating the number of ongoing paging transactions for the location area and processing the paging request (i.e. new calls are initiated on request until the number of counted calls is equivalent to a maximum allowed number of calls; Col. 2, lines 33-44. The MSC checks to see if the call counter has reached the threshold value and if not, allows the call and deducts from the value of the call counter (updates the number); Col. 4, lines 3-16),

wherein the respective maximum number which is allowed for the location area is defined for paging transactions of each of the kind comprising Call Control transactions, Supplementary Services transactions, Short Message Service transactions and Location Services transactions, respectively, the checking step being performed for each kind of (i.e. Lahtinen teaches limiting the number of calls to be initiated (i.e. call control paging requests) to a predetermined value (maximum number) and applies this to incoming voice calls; Col. 3, lines 16-24).

Regarding claim 32, Lahtinen teaches the method of claim 31, wherein the control node is a Mobile services Switching Center or a serving General Packet Radio Services support node (i.e. Lahtinen teaches a mobile services switching center (MSC); Col. 3, lines 16-24).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 24, 34 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahtinen in view of GB 2350918 to Joensuu et al. and US 2002/0171581 to Sheynblat et al.

Regarding claim 24, Lahtinen teaches the method of claim 23, but does not specifically teach further comprising the step of after a determination that the number of ongoing paging transactions is higher than or equal to the maximum number, checking whether the paging request derives from a Location Services request. However, at the time the invention was made the preceding limitation was known in the art of communications.

Joensuu teaches a paging system in a mobile communications network where the priority levels of incoming alerts (paging requests) are identified when the volume of incoming alerts (i.e. paging requests) is high and those alerts with a high priority level are broadcast (processed); page 7, second paragraph. Priority levels may be based on the type of incoming alert or the party's identity, so that critical alerts (paging requests) are not discarded; see page 8, first and second paragraphs. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the paging control system of Lahtinen with the priority levels of Joensuu in order to prevent discarding critical alerts. However,



Art Unit: 2617

the combination of Lahtinen and Joensuu does not specifically teach that the type of request checked for is a Location services request.

Sheynblat teaches giving location service requests for 911 (emergency) calls highest priority so that they can be processed as quickly as possible; paragraph 0067. Thus one skilled in the art would realize that the combination of Sheynblat with Lahtinen and Joensuu would teach checking for paging requests from emergency response location services and therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the paging control system of Lahtinen and Joensuu to give high priority to location service requests from emergency response sources as taught by Sheynblat because this would allow the emergency response requests to be processed as quickly as possible.

Regarding claim 34, Lahtinen teaches the telecommunications system of claim 33, but does not specifically teach the system further comprising a Location Services Request determining means for determining whether a paging request received by the control node derives from a Location Services request. However, at the time the invention was made the preceding limitation was known in the art of communications.

Joensuu teaches a paging system in a mobile communications network where the priority levels of incoming alerts (paging requests) are identified when the volume of incoming alerts (i.e. paging requests) is high and those alerts with a high priority level are broadcast (processed); page 7, second paragraph. Priority levels may be based on the type of incoming alert or the party's identity, so that critical alerts (paging requests) are not discarded; see page 8, first and second paragraphs. Therefore it would have

Art Unit: 2617

been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the paging control system of Lahtinen with the priority levels of Joensuu in order to prevent discarding critical alerts. However, the combination of Lahtinen and Joensuu does not specifically teach that the type of request checked for is a Location services request.

Sheynblat teaches giving location service requests for 911 (emergency) calls highest priority so that they can be processed as quickly as possible; paragraph 0067. Thus one skilled in the art would realize that the combination of Sheynblat with Lahtinen and Joensuu would teach a means for checking whether paging requests are from emergency response location services and therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the paging control system of Lahtinen and Joensuu to give high priority to location service requests from emergency response sources as taught by Sheynblat because this would allow the emergency response requests to be processed as quickly as possible.

Regarding claim 36, the combination of Lahtinen, Joensuu, and Sheynblat teaches the telecommunications system of claim 34, wherein the Location Services Request determining means are set so as to check whether the Location Services request comes from an Emergency Center or a Law Enforcement Agency (i.e. Joensuu teaches prioritizing incoming alerts (paging requests) by checking the requesting party's identity; Joensuu page 8, first and second paragraphs. Sheynblat teaches giving location requests from 911 calls (i.e. from an emergency center) highest priority; Sheynblat paragraph 0067. It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of

Art Unit: 2617

Joensuu and Sheynblat with the invention of Lahtinen in order to avoid discarding critical alerts and to process emergency response requests as quickly as possible).

Regarding claim 37, the combination of Lahtinen, Joensuu, and Sheynblat teaches the telecommunications system of claim 36, wherein the control nodes comprises buffer means for temporarily storing the paging request if the Location request is a request coming from an Emergency Center or from a Law Enforcement Agency, the paging means being set so as to serve the paging request with priority (i.e. Joensuu teaches prioritizing incoming alerts (paging requests) by checking the requesting party's identity; Joensuu page 8, first and second paragraphs. Sheynblat teaches giving location requests from 911 calls (i.e. from an emergency center) highest priority; Sheynblat paragraph 0067. It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Joensuu and Sheynblat with the invention of Lahtinen in order to avoid discarding critical alerts and to process emergency response requests as quickly as possible).

10. Claims 25-28 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Lahtinen, Joensuu, and Sheynblat as applied to claims 24 and 34 above, and further in view of US 2006/0128395 to Muhonen.

Regarding claim 25, the combination of Lahtinen, Joensuu, and Sheynblat teaches the method of claim 24, but does not specifically teach the method further comprising the step of checking whether the Location Services request is a request for last known location of the mobile station. However, at the time the invention was made the preceding limitation was known in the art of communications.

Muhonen teaches a method of providing location information in a mobile communication system where requests for the current location (i.e. the last known) of a mobile station are answered by returning the location information stored in the VLR provided that this stored information is "fresh" enough in order to prevent unnecessary paging; paragraphs 0008, 0022, Fig. 2. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the paging control system of Lahtinen, Joensuu, and Sheynblat by checking for whether the location services request is a request for the current location of a mobile station as taught by Muhonen in order to prevent unnecessary paging.

Regarding claim 26, the combination of Lahtinen, Joensuu, Sheynblat, and Muhonen teaches the method of claim 25, further comprising the step of checking whether the Location Service request comes from an Emergency Center or a Law Enforcement Agency (i.e. Joensuu teaches prioritizing incoming alerts (paging requests) by checking the requesting party's identity; Joensuu page 8, first and second paragraphs. Sheynblat teaches giving location requests from 911 calls (i.e. from an emergency center) highest priority; Sheynblat paragraph 0067. It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Joensuu and Sheynblat with the invention of Lahtinen in order to avoid discarding critical alerts and to process emergency response requests as quickly as possible).

Regarding claim 27, the combination of Lahtinen, Joensuu, Sheynblat, and Muhonen teaches the method of claim 26, further comprising the step of, after a determination that the Location Services request comes from an Emergency Center or a

Art Unit: 2617

Law Enforcement Agency, serving the paging request with priority (i.e. Joensuu teaches prioritizing incoming alerts (paging requests) by checking the requesting party's identity; Joensuu page 8, first and second paragraphs. Sheynblat teaches giving location requests from 911 calls (i.e. from an emergency center) highest priority; Sheynblat paragraph 0067. It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Joensuu and Sheynblat with the invention of Lahtinen in order to avoid discarding critical alerts and to process emergency response requests as quickly as possible).

Regarding claim 28, the combination of Lahtinen, Joensuu, Sheynblat, and Muhonen teaches the method of claim 25, further comprising the step of retrieving information on the last known location from a Visitor Location Register (i.e. Muhonen teaches returning the location information stored in the VLR provided that this stored information is "fresh" enough; paragraphs 0008, 0022, Fig. 2. It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Muhonen with the inventions of Lahtinen, Joensuu, and Sheynblat in order to prevent unnecessary paging).

Regarding claim 35, the combination of Lahtinen, Joensuu, and Sheynblat teaches the telecommunications system of claim 34, wherein the Location Services Request determining means are set so as to check whether the Location Services request is a request for last known location of the mobile station. However, at the time of the invention the preceding limitation was known in the art of communications.

Muhonen teaches a method of providing location information in a mobile communication system where requests for the current location (i.e. the last known) of a mobile station are answered by returning the location information stored in the VLR

Art Unit: 2617

provided that this stored information is "fresh" enough in order to prevent unnecessary paging; paragraphs 0008, 0022, Fig. 2. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the paging control system of Lahtinen, Joensuu, and Sheynblat by checking for whether the location services request is a request for the current location of a mobile station as taught by Muhonen in order to prevent unnecessary paging.

11. Claims 33, 38 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahtinen.

Regarding claim 33, Lahtinen teaches a telecommunications system for controlling a paging flow in a network for cellular communications having at least one control node associated with a location area (i.e. an MSC with location areas; Col. 5, lines 1-16) serving a mobile station to be paged, the control node having means for receiving paging requests (i.e. the MSC it connected to base station subsystems, other MSCs, and the PSTN, and receives calls to be sent to mobile stations, therefore means for receiving paging requests; Col. 3, line 48 to Col. 4 line 16), the system comprising:

memory means for storing at least one maximum number of ongoing paging transactions allowed for the location area and for storing the number of ongoing paging transactions (i.e. Lahtinen discloses call counters that store the number of calls to be initialized and a counter threshold value register that stores the maximum number of allowed calls, therefore memory means; Col. 3, lines 24-47, Col. 5 lines 9-16),

wherein the memory means comprise stored the maximum number of allowed ongoing paging Call Control transactions, the comparing means being set so as the

Art Unit: 2617

checking is performed for each of the Call Control transactions (i.e. Lahtinen teaches setting a maximum number of calls to be initiated (paging requests) in a location area and that the maximum number can be set separately for each location area in accordance with performance, Col. 5, lines 1-8);

comparing means for checking whether the number of ongoing paging transactions is lower than the at least one maximum number (i.e. Lahtinen discloses a comparator for determining whether the call counter has met the counter threshold value, therefore comparing means; Col. 3, lines 40-47, Col. 5, lines 9-16); and

paging means for paging the mobile station in response to an outcome of the comparing means (i.e. the MSC initiates calls (pages mobile stations) via base station controllers until the number of calls to be initiated reaches the threshold value, therefore paging means; Col. 2, lines 33-44).

Lahtinen does not specifically teach respective maximum numbers indicative of the maximum number of allowed ongoing paging Supplementary Services transactions, Short Message Service transactions, and Location Service transactions, respectively, or that the checking is performed for each of the Supplementary Services transactions, Short Message Service transactions and Location Service transactions, respectively. However, at the time the invention was made the preceding limitation was known in the art of communications.

The claimed invention improves upon the system of Lahtinen by establishing a maximum number of ongoing paging requests for different categories of ongoing paging requests (i.e. from call control, supplementary services, short message services, and

Art Unit: 2617

location services) within a location area and checking that the amount of paging requests for each category of paging requests does not exceed the maximum number for that category. The claimed invention uses counters to track the number of ongoing paging requests and comparators to ensure that the maximum number of ongoing paging requests is not reached, just as Lahtinen teaches. The claimed invention uses a known technique of adding additional counters for more detailed tracking of paging requests (Lahtinen teaches adding additional counters for tracking paging requests in each location area to achieve more detailed tracking) in order to solve the problem of how to track the amount of ongoing paging requests for each category of paging request. Previously one skilled in the art would need to set up a separate system as taught by Lahtinen for each category of paging request in order to track the amount of ongoing paging requests for each category of paging request. Adding additional counters to track the number of ongoing paging requests for each category of paging request solves the problem by effectively creating a single system that separately tracks the number of ongoing paging requests for different types of paging requests. That is to say, the claimed invention combined multiple iterations of the system taught by Lahtinen into a single system. The basic technique of adding additional counters to track different categories of paging requests yields no more than the predictable outcome that one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected to achieve using this known technique. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the paging load limiting system of Lahtinen so as to include memory for storing the maximum number of ongoing paging requests for various types



Art Unit: 2617

of paging requests and checking for each type of paging request because this would yield predictable results.

Regarding claim 38, Lahtinen teaches the telecommunications system of claim 33, wherein the control node comprises at least one counter indicative of the number of ongoing transactions, the counter being incremented when a paging request is accepted for processing by the control node and being decremented when a paging response has been returned by the mobile station.

Regarding claim 40, Lahtinen teaches the telecommunications system of claim 33, wherein the memory means are comprised in any one of the Mobile Services Switching Center, a Visitor Location Register connected to the Mobile Services Switching Center, a Base Station Controller connected to the Mobile Services Switching Center and serving the location area (i.e. Lahtinen teaches the registers and counters may be located in the mobile services switching center (MSC); Fig. 2, Col. 3, line 48 to Col. 4 line 2, Col 5, lines 9-16).

Regarding claim 41, Lahtinen teaches the telecommunications system of claim 33 wherein the comparing means are comprised in the control node (i.e. Lahtinen teaches the call control computer is located in the MSC; Fig. 2, Col. 3, line 48 to Col. 4, line 2, Col. 5, lines 9-16).

Regarding claim 42, Lahtinen teaches the telecommunications system of claim 33 wherein the paging means further comprises a Mobile Services Switching Center and a Base Station Controller serving the location area (i.e. Lahtinen teaches a MSC

Art Unit: 2617

and a base station controller connecting a mobile station to a network switch; Fig. 1, Col. 3, line 48 to Col. 4, line 2).

Regarding claim 43, Lahtinen teaches the telecommunications system of claim 33, wherein the number of ongoing paging transactions is the overall number of ongoing transactions, regardless of the kind of transaction (i.e. Lahtinen teaches limiting calls to be initiated (paging requests) regardless of whether they are incoming or outgoing (i.e. kind of transaction), therefore an overall number; Col. 3, lines 16-24).

Regarding claim 44, Lahtinen teaches the telecommunications system of claim 33, wherein the control node is a mobile services switching center or a serving general packet radio services support node (i.e. Lahtinen teaches a MSC; Col. 3, lines 40-47).

### ***Conclusion***

12. A copy of the cited prior art GB 2350918 to Joensuu et al. was provided with the previous Office Action, therefore a copy will not be furnished with this Office Action.

13. The Examiner has made reference to particular sections of the cited prior art considered most applicable to the specific limitations within the individual claims for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. Applicant should consider the entire prior art, in addition to the cited passages, as applicable to the limitations of the claims and as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2617

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan Pitt whose telephone number is (571) 270-7466. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 am - 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/B. P./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617